REMARKS

In the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Tanaka (U.S. Pat. No. 6,052,112). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Tanaka, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chen (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0080931).

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Xiao and Supervisory Primary Examiner Lefkowitz for the consideration given applicant's attorney at the interview of October 31, 2007. At the interview, agreement was reached to distinguish claim 1 over the prior art rejection.

In response to the informalities noted by the Examiner, claim 3 has been canceled and claim 1 has been amended. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 has been amended as follows:

(1) One field of a digital drive signal is divided into a plurality of subfields so that the digital drive signal can be supplied to the liquid crystal display *per subfield.* As shown in Fig. 10, a digital drive signal having the voltage Vp is supplied to the liquid crystal display for each of the subfields B'0 to B'5.

(2) The subfields include at least one first subfield (such as B'0 in Fig. 10) having *one pulse* of the digital drive signal and at least one second subfield (such as B'4 in Fig. 10) having a *plurality of pulses* of the digital drive signal.

(3) The second subfield has a plurality of *pairs* of equal length of a display-off period and equal length of a display-on period, such as the subfield B'4 and also the subfield B'5.

(4) The *total* of the display-off period *and the display-on period* of the second subfield is shorter than the given period. A response time (the claimed given period) is about 3.46 ms for the liquid crystal in the embodiment., And, for example, in Table 2 in the specification, the total of the display-off period (1.38 ms) and the display-on period (0.36 ms) of the second subfield B'4 (B'5) is shorter than the given period (3.46 ms), or $1.38 + 0.36 < 3.46$.

(5) A voltage *equal to or higher than* (previously in claim 3) a saturated drive voltage is supplied as the digital drive signal to the liquid crystal for each display-on period *per subfield* to modulate light incident in the liquid crystal.

The Examiner still insists that the subfields B2 and B3 in AAPA correspond to the claimed second subfield, or the subfields B2 + B3 = the claimed second subfield.

The definition of the claimed first and second subfields is as follows:

The first subfield has one pulse whereas the second subfield has a plurality of pulses. The first subfield has one display-off period and one display-on period whereas the second subfield has a plurality of pairs of a display-off period and a display-on period. And, the digital drive signal is supplied to the liquid crystal display *per subfield.*

In contrast in AAPA, one subfield consists of a display-off period and a display-on period, as disclosed in page 5, lines 29 to 31. And, the saturation voltage Vp (digital drive signal) is supplied to the liquid crystal for each of the subfields (per subfield) B0 to B5, as disclosed in page 5, line 35 to page 6, line 16.

As disclosed in page 5, lines 21 to 32, the six subfields B0 to B5 are applied to, for example, the least-significant bit to the most-significant bit, respectively, of 6-bit data. In other words, each of the subfields, to which one field of a digital drive signal is divided, has a period for supplying one piece of data (of, for example, 6-bit data) to the liquid crystal display.

Each of the subfields B0 to B5 (each carrying the saturation voltage Vp) that consists of a display-off period and a display-on period is the subfield in question and may correspond to the claimed *first* subfield.

However, the combination of the two subfields B2 and B3, or B2 + B3 (Fig. 9), in AAPA cannot or should not be interpreted as the claimed second subfield, such

as the subfield B'4 or the subfield B'5 (Fig. 10). If combined, the combined one subfield (B2 + B3) supplies two pieces of data (of, for example, 6-bit data) to the liquid crystal display. In contrast, the claimed second subfield supplies one piece of data (of, for example, 6-bit data) to the liquid crystal display, because the digital drive signal is supplied per subfield in the amended claim 1.

The Examiner's previous interpretation of the subfield cannot be applied to amended claim 1. Therefore, amended claim 1 is not believed to be unpatentable over AAPA in view of Tanaka under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims in the present application, as they now stand, patentably distinguish over the references cited and applied by the Examiner and are, therefore, in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is in order, and such favorable action and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

However, if after reviewing the above amendments and remarks, the Examiner has any questions or comments, he is cordially invited to contact the undersigned attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

By: _____
John C. Holman
Reg. No. 22,769

400 Seventh Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2201
(202) 638-6666
Date: October 31, 2007
JCH/JLS/crj